

In re Application of: Hanan KEREN et al
Serial No.: 10/556,483
Filed: November 14, 2005
Office Action Mailing Date: June 2, 2009

Examiner: PATRICIA C. MALLARI
Group Art Unit: 3735
Attorney Docket: 30811

concept linking the independent claims such that there is a lack of unity of invention, and that the remaining subject matter of the independent claims of Group I and Group II are related only as a method and apparatus for carrying out the method.

The Examiner, however, does not provide appropriate information related to the differences that would necessitate separate searches and thus be serious burden on the Examiner.

This line of reasoning is incorrect and compels the Applicants to conclude that the PTO imposed restriction requirement with respect to groups I and II is improper. It is submitted that although claims 75-116 belong to a different category than claims 117-145, the limitations found the claims in group I are the same as the limitation found in the claims of group II.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement. Applicants also retain the right to pursue the inventions belonging to the non-elected groups in additional divisional applications that claim priority to the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests an early examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: June 15, 2009